



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The striking image conveyed by the adjective *blind*, as applied to *sea*, v. 249, might be paralleled by Tennyson's fine phrase *The blind wave. Vivien.*

With 'The mate of misery' cf. Shelley's lyric *Misery*, stanza 3: "Misery, we have known each other," etc., and Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, lix, "O sorrow, wilt thou live with me?"

The speculative tone of the introduction to *The Dream* is distinctively suggestive of Shelley or Wordsworth. Cf., for instance, Shelley's *Lines on Mount Blanc*, dated June 23, 1816, particularly phrases like "the mightier world of sleep," "the veil of life and death" with the opening of *The Dream*: v. 1, "sleep hath its own world," etc.

The image contained in *The Dream*, l. 124, 125,

So cloudless clear and purely beautiful  
That God alone was to be seen in Heaven,

might be contrasted with the Ancient Mariner's picture of Desolation;

So lonely 'twas that God himself  
Scarce seemed there to be.

The publication of *The Burial of Sir John Moore* in a German edition of Byron's works (Broenner, Frankfurt, 1826) may be noticed, in conclusion, as due to the fact that Wolfe's celebrated Ode, on being frequently reprinted without the initials C. W. affixed to the original poem, came to be claimed by a variety of persons as their production, Byron being particularly named as its supposed author by Captain Medwin in 1824. Though Archdeacon Russell finally settled the question of authorship in his *Memoir of C. Wolfe*, 1825, the Ode could, strangely enough, be still regarded in Germany in the following year as one of Byron's compositions. See C. Wolfe: *Encyclopædia Brit.* and a note on the 'Cynotaph,' *Ingoldsby Legends*, Bentley, London, 1869, p. 21.

The object of the present edition of Byron's works is, as we have seen, "to faithfully depict the literary development of the greatest English poet of our century."

Opinions may differ as to this estimate of the poet, so widely different to that generally prevalent among his own countrymen; and contemporary criticism, guided by the literary canons with which it has been fur-

nished by the consummate art of Tennyson, and disposed to make perfection of form perhaps too exclusive a test of excellence, may still refuse to concede to the man whom Goethe selected as the representative of the modern poetic era that preëminent position obtained by those "artists in verse" whose powers of execution are fully on a level with their poetic inspiration.

Be this as it may, the verdict passed by his own country on this 'master influence' of his age does indeed, in view of the revived interest in Byron's personality and poetry which has manifested itself of late, seem to be in a fair way of being reconsidered, in the light, not merely of the opinion of our time, but of that of the poet's contemporaries, and foreign critics, and by means of a careful and discriminating examination of his works, to the scholarly study of which the present edition of *The Prisoner of Chillon and other Poems* will be welcomed as an important contribution.

F. H. PUGHE.

*Breslau, Germany.*

#### GERMAN GRAMMAR.

*Deutsche Sprachlehre für Anfänger* von CARLA WENCKEBACH. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1896. 8vo, pp. xx, 404.

THIS is a welcome contribution to the available materials for teaching American beginners the elements of the German language through German, as chief medium of communication between teacher and taught. The author divides the work into three *Stufen*. The first is an introduction to the language, including (a) pronunciation exercises, (b) simple grammatical rules and drill exercises, (c) development lessons, (d) *Les- und Sprechübungen*, (e) exercises in translation from English into German and from German into English, and (f) *Sprachstücke*, or selections. The second and third *Stufen* aim at a complete, though not exhaustive, presentation in natural sequence of the salient features of Accidence, Syntax, and Etymology. In this portion of the work especial stress is laid upon the strong and weak declensions and conjugations, the modal auxiliaries, the infinitive and participle, the subjunctive and indicative moods, and upon

word-formation. On pages 140-143 and 192-197 are tabular statements of the main features of declension and conjugation, which are intended for regular reference in connection with all lessons save the very first. In the second *Stufe* the use of disconnected sentences is reduced to the minimum and all grammatical principles are elucidated by means of *Sprachstücke*, whose coherency of thought commands the increased interest and attention of the learner. In the third *Stufe* quotations from poets and prose writers take the place of the *Sprachstücke* used in the first two *Stufen*.

In the preface (p. vi) the author states so pithily the reason for a liberal use of German in the class-room that I quote her words:

"The attempt at making German the language of the class-room is *not* for the sake of promoting power in conversation; it is a means to a far more important end. Speaking and hearing the foreign language results in *Ablernen*, or learning by absorption. The process by which a child acquires his native tongue from his parents is wholly a process of *Ablernen*. It would be absurd for an older pupil to cast aside the advantages of trained intelligence by depending upon *Ablernen* alone; it would be no less foolish for him to deprive himself of one of the best means of gaining both the *Sprachgefühl* and the *Sprachmaterial* on the ground that this is the child's method. . . . Whatever words, forms, and idioms he can understand in hearing and use in speaking, he possesses absolutely; all others belong more or less to the dictionary."

The book as a whole shows the pedagogical knowledge and tact that are the fruit of long class-room experience. The insight and sense of proportion of an earnest and successful teacher are reflected in the sequence of parts, emphasis upon essentials, and abundance of well-chosen illustrative material. From cover to cover the progress is from example to precept, never the reverse. The typography of the work is excellent. Especially praiseworthy is the use of full-faced type in items of chief importance, upon their first appearance in the book.

I regard as wise the omission of almost all English equivalents for the various sounds of the language, leaving this important matter to the *viva voce* treatment of the teacher. The vocal correspondences between English and German are only in a few cases exact. Com-

pare the current statements of our leading grammars concerning the vowels and stops in general and *g*, *r*, *l*, and *w* in particular. Such unavoidable inaccuracies furnish the student with distorted sound-images that must be blotted out before a correct pronunciation can be acquired. Worse still, if possible, is the resulting blindness of the learner to the existence of a peculiar *timbre* pervading all the sounds of the language and defying the deftest efforts at its reproduction in printer's ink.

On page 2, *l*, 3, *ee*, *aa* and *oo* are classed with the real diphthongs, although they are of course mere devices for indicating the long quantity of simple *e*, *a*, and *o*. A statement concerning *l*, *t*, *p*, *k*, and *f* like those just objected to, which abound in our standard German-English grammars, occurs p. 12, ll. 5 sq.: *Folgende Laute sind im Deutschen und im Englischen ganz gleich: m, n, l, t, p, k, f*. Page 21 contains under *Aussprachübungen*, 4, a similarly misleading remark: *wist englisches v: Wein, wohl, ewig, zwölf*. I heartily agree with the substance of a foot-note on page 9, calling attention to the importance of learning the definite article as an organic part of each substantive. The significance of this note would have warranted its appearance in full-faced type. Scarcely in harmony with this sane view of the most effective way of mastering the gender of nouns are the early statement, p. 5: *Das Geschlecht der Hauptwörter kann männlich, weiblich oder sächlich sein*, and *Aufgabe C*, p. 7, wherein nouns minus the article are to be translated from English into German. Discussions of grammatical gender at the outset seem to me not merely devoid of all utility,—save that doubtful sort that enables students to pass unwisely set examinations,—but also positively harmful, in that they focus attention upon classification, instead of the exact form of each substantive. My objection to *Aufgabe C* is that habitual association of the definite article with each noun as an organic part of it is not furthered by exercises that discard the article.

The statement (p. 8, l. 4): *ng und nk sind ein Laut* is ambiguous. On page 15, ll. 7 sq., and frequently elsewhere in the book, the author yields to the analogy of English and uses *meinen* in the sense of *bedeuten*: *Der Bruder*

meint mein Bruder oder dein Bruder oder der Bruder Karls, etc. At the top of page 17, the vague adjectives *sanft* and *scharf* are used to describe the sound of *s*, instead of the precise phonetical terms *tönend* and *tonlos*. It is not clear why *ff* and *ß* do not share the attention accorded in the preceding line to *s* in the statement of habitual position (p. 17, *Aussprachübungen*, 3). Instead of the remark (p. 17, 4): *Das z und das tz sind sehr scharf*, it would be equally simple and more accurate to say: *Das z und das tz sind wie ts auszusprechen*. The use of *überlesen* instead of *durchlesen* at the bottom of page 22, the middle of page 33, and the bottom of page 110, etc., I ascribe to the influence of the English *read over*. The forms *Was habet ihr?* and *Ihr habet die Feder* (p. 24) are archaic, and ought not to stand as normal usage in the paradigm. The discrepancy between them and the form *ihr habt* of *Aufgabe A* and *Aufgabe B*, pp. 25 and 26, remains unexplained in the text (Cf., too, paradigms, pp. 34 and 35). another archaism that passes unnoticed by the author is the English *thou hast*, introduced in *Aufgabe C*, p. 26, and elsewhere, as if it, instead of *you have*, were the normal English equivalent of *du hast*. Near the bottom of page 30 and in the vocabulary, p. 363, I note the provincial accentuation: *Pastör*, instead of *Pästor*.

Although the author of the grammar formally recognizes the relative, *der*, *die*, *das*, as the equivalent of *welcher*, *welche*, *welches* (p. 234), the latter appears in over ninety per cent of all relative sentences in the text of the book. This circumstance imparts to the style a bookish flavor, in view of the preference for *der*, *die*, *das*, manifested by the language of everyday life. In the conspectus of declension (p. 143) *B*, I, 2 should stand in the interest of precision: *Die nicht auf e endigenden, mehrsilbigen Femina*, etc., and *C*, 2 should be, for the same reason: *Die nicht auf e endigenden, mehrsilbigen Maskulina und die mehrsilbigen Neutra ohne die Vorsilbe ge*, etc. The popular use of *uns(er)er* and *eu(er)er* as genitives of the personal pronouns *wir* and *ihr* is so distinctly due to carelessness or ignorance as to warrant no such approving mention as that contained in the note at the bottom of p. 157 and

in *Aufgabe A*, p. 158. In line 22, p. 164, a superfluous comma separates the adjective *türkischer* from its noun *Tabak*. Page 193 presents a "scientific classification of the strong verbs according to Grimm and Blatz." I can see no advantage derivable from a numbering of the *Ablautsreihen* that fails to tally with that of Streithberg in his Primitive Germanic and Gothic grammars, of Braune in his Gothic and Old High German grammars, and of Paul in his grammar of Middle High German. On the contrary there is a positive advantage in burdening the memory but once with anything as mechanical as the mere sequence of coördinate ablaut-series. The table should be adjusted, not to Blatz, but to Braune, to facilitate further study of the historical development of the language. The note under III, p. 208, *Die schwachen und starken Formen haben gleiche Bedeutung* is certainly incorrect, as far as *bewog*, *bewegte* and *bewogen*, *bewegt* are concerned. *Wollen* should be included in the parenthesis with *sollen* (p. 210, 44, I, 3). The familiar (mis)use of *derselbe*, *dieselbe*, *dasselbe* in place of *er*, *sie*, *es* is mentioned at the top of page 233, with no word of caution as to its adoption. The statement as to the use of *wo* (*wor*)+prepositions, p. 235, IV, 2, in place of the regular relative pronoun, is too sweeping. To page 241, 53, I, 2, should be added *ein Uhr*. On Page 244, III, 1, we should read *viertelhalb* ( $3\frac{1}{2}$ ), instead of *drittelhalb*. The more usual plural of *Laden*, 'window-shutter,' is *Laden*, not *Läden* (cf. p. 248, V, 3). The substance of the foot-note on page 9 appears again in the third *Stufe*, at the bottom of page 257: *Wegen der vielen Unregelmässigkeiten sollte man jedes einzelne Wort mit dem Artikel zusammen lernen*. I have yet to meet a single English speaking student, trained to depend only upon grammatical classifications, who possessed any adequate control of the gender of German nouns. Since upon this control depends the correct use of personal, relative, and demonstrative pronouns and of the adjective inflection, the point in question is of no slight importance.

On page 259, II, 4, *das Petschaft* might well have been mentioned as the only exception to the rule. The plural of *das Schauer* (p. 262, 6) is *die Schauer*, without *-n*. *Gehalt*, 'salary,' is

usually neuter (cf. p. 261, 6 and 263, 9). To the list of feminines in *-er* with plural in *-ern* on pages 266-7 *die Nüster* might well be added. At the bottom of page 270 we note the misprint *cheissen* for *heissen*. Better than the proposed form, p. 282, 4: *Bin ich und mein Freund eingeladen?* would be: *Sind mein Freund und ich eingeladen?* The illustrations given p. 283, II, 1, 3, and 4, have become so shuffled as to render it necessary to recast the whole subdivision. P. 288, iii, 2, contains too sweeping a statement about the use of the English imperfect. Instead of *immer* we ought to read *fast immer* (cf. the correct English sentence: *The child has fallen asleep*). The substance of 292, 8 should appear, not as a separate heading, but as note to 290, XI, ii, 3. The more usual form is: *Dieser Kelch ist von Gold*, or, *Dieser Kelch ist aus Gold gemacht* (cf. p. 296, I. 1.). The preposition *über* has escaped the attention of the printer, p. 297, II, 1. More accurate than *is* would be *was*, p. 298, 12.

One of the least satisfactory chapters in the whole grammar is the discussion and illustration of Sound-Shifting on pages 301, 302, 303. For the sake of brevity the author has condensed the matter to the point of obscurity. For instance, the table of correspondences between Indo-European and Germanic sounds, on the one hand, and between Primitive Germanic and High German, on the other, p. 302, is a mere fragment, not even as comprehensive as the few examples that immediately follow it. The statement of Verner's Law, p. 303, is entirely inadequate, containing not even a hint of the conditions under which surd spirants become sonant spirants. I doubt the utility of such imperfect glimpses of sound-development and sound-relationship. Not only misconceptions, but, worse yet, the conceit of half knowledge are their inevitable fruit.

In place of *h* in the table on page 301 we ought to have *ɣ*, assonant spirant, and in place of *z*, page 303, 1, we ought to have *ʒ*. The use of Gothic characters for representing other than modern sounds is objectionable, because of the misleading association of Modern German. The Roman characters, supplemented by sundry modifications already adopted by leading phoneticians every where are far better (cf. Hempl: *German Orthography and Pho-*

*nology*. Boston, Ginn and Co., 1897, pp. xxv sq.).

On page 307 we read under the caption *-heit, -keit*: *Das Suffix -keit verbindet sich mit Adjektiven auf -bar, -el, -er, -ig, -lich, -sam*, and find no mention of the exceptions, *Sicherheit, Leckerheit, Lockerheit*, etc. Under the next caption, *-icht* we find *das Dickicht*, cited as a collective term from a verbal root, by the side of *das Kehrlicht* and *das Spüllicht*. P. 317, III, 1, contains the sentence: *In Nachtigall und Bräutigam existiert noch ein altes i als Bindevokal*. The insertion of the adjective *suffixales* before *i* would render the statement more accurately descriptive. In the third line below this the omission of *e* before *er, en* leaves the following illustration, *Gänseblume*, without obvious bearing. P. 318, I. 1, belongs logically to p. 317, III, 1, *b*. Doubtless under the influence of English we read at the top of p. 325, *komplex* instead of *kompliziert*. The principle, mentioned on page 327, I, 6, that dictated the omission from the vocabulary of the genitive singular of all substantives seems to me of questionable validity. I believe that the pupil should be taught from the beginning the prime importance of learning on first sight three things about each and every noun: 1, the nominative singular with the definite article (cf. the last three lines of page 257 of this grammar); 2, the genitive singular, and, 3, the nominative plural. To facilitate this should be the aim of the arrangement of the substantive part of the vocabulary. The omission of the genitive singular, and request that the student infer this form from the other given forms, recommend to the learner dependence upon classifications, instead of upon direct observation.

When the accent of the singular of a noun shifts to form the plural, this change should be noted in the vocabulary (cf. *Charakter*, p. 337, and *Pästor*, p. 363).

The division of the first two *Stufen* of the book into lessons denoted by Arabic numerals, with numerous subdivisions indicated by Roman characters, that are in turn easily confused with other Roman numerals of nearly the same size, used to designate minor parts of these subdivisions, renders accurate reference difficult. A similar objection may justly

be urged against the double function assigned to Roman characters of about the same size in the third *Stufe*. A running series of paragraphs extending through the whole book, denoted by Arabic numerals and furnished with suitably indicated subdivisions, would be a decided improvement in a subsequent edition. The value of the work and my desire for the early appearance of a second edition are the occasion of this somewhat lengthy and minute review.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.  
University of Chicago.

### DANTE.

*The Treatment of Nature in Dante's 'Divina Commedia,'* by L. OSCAR KUHN. Edward Arnold, 1897. 16 mo, pp. 208.

PROFESSOR KUHN, in his book on Dante's Treatment of Nature, has succeeded in making a very readable volume without in the least sacrificing accuracy. Both in readability and in scholarship the book is infinitely better than Professor Palgrave's *Landscape in Poetry*, the only other notable book of the year in the same field. Professor Kuhn's statements are all definite and precise, and based on indisputable facts. There is not even one vague generalization.

In the first chapter, we find that Dante means by *Nature*

"those processes by which all earthly things come into being, and her activity is engaged by producing those forms which are shaped out of original matter, itself primarily created by God" (p. 4).

Dante differed from Aristotle and the ancients generally in sharply distinguishing between Nature and God; from the modern world (the important distinction for us) in that

"there is practically no evidence that he ever employed it in the modern acceptation of the physical world about us—the outward show of sea and sky, of river, hill, and stream and flower" (p. 13).

In the chapter on Dante's conventional treatment of nature, (nature in its modern sense, of course) the author makes much use of the treacherous parallel passage. When we consider the pitfalls into which it has led, for example, many commentators on the

*Romaunt of the Rose*, and even Professor Furnivall, we must admit that Professor Kuhn is eminently sensible. Dante, he tells us, knew the Latin writers well, and

"these authors surrounded Dante's view of Nature with a learned and classic atmosphere: on seeing, for instance, a certain phenomenon, his mind would instantly recur to some passage of Vergil or Ovid, and it is this fact he tells us about, rather than the actual details of the scene in question" (p. 23).

This habit of mind is precisely characteristic of Chaucer and of the eighteenth century English poets. After pointing out many curiously close resemblances between Dante and medieval writers, Professor Kuhn says:

"There are a number of very interesting verbal resemblances between Dante and other medieval writers, by whom he could not have been in any way influenced. If these resemblances are not mere coincidences, they can be due only to the widespread use of conventional figures and metaphors" (p. 42).

Even if these resemblances *are* mere coincidences, they seem to me none the less indications of Dante's conventional treatment, for when we see only what others see, we are quite likely to describe in the terms that others use. For instance, to most men, grass is green, and its greenness is naturally expressed by different men in terms monotonously similar and conventional.

Although in this second chapter, Professor Kuhn has tried to eliminate the conventional side of Dante's treatment of nature, in the rest of the volume we constantly meet with instances of another sort of conventionality which limited, not Dante's manner of treatment, but his subject-matter. Following his age Dante shows, for example, almost no appreciation of mountain scenery or landscape of any kind, of ruins, or of wild flowers. Dante's flowers all grew in a well-kept garden, and were mostly lilies and roses; ruins he mentions only; mountains he has climbed, but he dwells on their difficulties, not their beauties; and of the wonderful beauty of Italy, of the Riviera, Venice, Florence, he seems entirely oblivious.

This prevailing conventionality of subject and treatment, however, serves only to emphasize the passages that show Dante's personal and accurate observation. His minute and